

**College of the Redwoods
Program Review Committee
3/10/2017, SS 104, Time, 9am-11am
Agenda**

- 1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:**
- 2. REVIEW/APPROVE 2/24/16 NOTES:**
- 3. ACTION ITEMS:**
- 4. UPDATES:**
- 5. DISCUSSION ITEMS:**
 - Executive Summary
 - Template Revisions
- 6. STANDING AGENDA ITEM: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**
- 7. OTHER/FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Next meeting: Friday, March 24, 2017

"When the finger points at the moon, the fool looks at the finger." (Unknown)

CCC Confer:

Participant Passcode: **147386**

***Toll free number available: 1-888-886-3951**

**College of the Redwoods
Program Review Committee
2/24/2017, SS 104, Time, 9am-11am
Notes**

1. CALLED MEETING TO ORDER: *Present:* Joe Hash, Brady Reed, Levi Gill, Mike Peterson, Mickey Jarvi, Phil Mancus, Crislyn Parker-support; ***Guest*** Angelina Hill
Absent: Kristin Chorbi

2. REVIEW/APPROVE 2/10/16 NOTES: Approved as written.

3. ACTION ITEMS:

<i>3.1 Annual Instructional Reviews</i>	<i>Comprehensive Reviews, cont'd</i>
Non-Credit/Adult Education* <i>Exemplary previous planning section</i>	Business/Technology
Physical Science	Humanities, Communications
<i>Comprehensive Reviews</i>	Paramedic
Administration of Justice/Basic Academy	Restaurant Hospitality Management
Math* <i>Overall excellent comprehensive review; especially assessment and closing the loop</i>	

4. UPDATES: Angelina Hill

- In addition to evaluating program reviews, determining whether processes are being followed, and assessments and planning are tied to institutional goals, AP 4021 gives the PRC authority to look at the health of a program. If there is consensus, PRC may move forward with a recommendation to submit a program to the 4021 revitalization, discontinuation process, or bring their concerns to the VP for determination. The AP 4021 process can be initiated through PRC, VPISD, Faculty or Deans, or any combo thereof.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- Humanities liberal arts degree is so large and cumbersome it is difficult to have substantive program dialog. A suggestion to move this to and English or Art ADT.
- Modify rubric:
 - Revise *Previous Plans section* to include language to the effect: if previous year plans are not completed, address the impact, whether negative or positive. If plans are feasible, they should be included in current planning; if not, discuss this and include in your review why you are not moving forward with a particular plan.
 - Review rubric and clarify/add more instructional language
- One or two programs have been moving the same plans forward, with no completed action and no impact of action (or lack thereof).
- Is there a deadline for completing program level assessments? Add or clarify instructions in the assessment reporting tool?

6. STANDING AGENDA ITEM: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Modify template:
 - More focused instructions in the template; e.g. in comprehensives reviews, authors need to not only include data, but provide an analysis of data where pertinent
 - Remove “optional” fields
 - Suggestion to include/separate out data for online and face to face courses for analysis

**College of the Redwoods
Program Review Committee
2/24/2017, SS 104, Time, 9am-11am
Notes**

- Trends:
 - Tendency to write plans as resource requests, which are not measureable or assessable.
 - Even when assessment are done well, there is a tendency not to include results in planning or resource requests. Still some disconnects tying the process together.
- Two programs were discussed as possibilities for the 4021 process. These will be forwarded to the VPISD for further action.

7. OTHER/FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- PRC was unable to find a program level assessments for Business Technology

Next meeting: Friday, March 10, 2017

“When the finger points at the moon, the fool looks at the finger.” (Unknown)

**Program Review Committee
Executive Summary Notes
Committee Discussions for Template/Process Revisions**

Template/Process Revisions

10/28/16 Notes:

5.2 Discussion on resource request ranking when multiple programs request the same resource (e.g. desks or tables or chairs).

- Committee discussed recommending a check box be added to either the templates, or the resource ranking spreadsheet, for requests received from multiple areas for the same item. This can be done when Deans and Directors review and rank the resource requests prior to submission to the BPC. Brady will discuss with Angelina.
- A concern was raised that the consultation requirement for resource requests is not a gatekeeping process, but an impartial evaluation whether the request can be incorporated into our structure, facilities, etc. Joe and Brady will discuss this with Angelina.

11/16/17 Notes

6.2 Remove *Resource Requests* from rubrics, under *Program Plans & Resource Requests* (automatically tied to planning).

6.3 On Student Services Template, section 4, Evaluations of Previous Plans: remove the (if applicable) option. Something should be written even if is only to state they requested or did not receive resources for those plans, or that there was no direct contribution, etc.

12/10/16 Notes

- The committee discussed providing additional training for administrators. Joe and Brady will discuss with Angelina. There are still administration reviews that list resource requests as a “plan”. The resource requests need to be a tool of completing the plan.
- BPC committees will only rank requests for items over \$3,000. Discussion that this is a decision that needs to be decided and communicated early in the semester. Also discussed this is a number that should remain constant from year to year, unless it is determined otherwise through review and analysis of process.

1/27/17 Notes

- Instructional Template: discussion to add an additional box, or revise language to request the use of some type of data when evaluating previous plans.
- Section 4.2 dialog box: Revise language to reflect: “...how actions taken and/or funds provided, contribute to program improvement” instead of limiting this box to just how “funds” provided support.
- Administration Services Template: committee suggestion to rename the evaluation of previous plans to reflect “assessment of critical plan and results”
- Inclusion of a data tab (not included in the Administration templates) in which to analyze/evaluate some data?

2/10/17 Notes

- **Rubric (Instructional):**
 - Add language to the planning section about *not* using resource requests as planning actions.
 - Add/emphasize language on how assessment has been used in planning and/or to improve the program (point of the assessment process).
 - Remove reference to “*Planning numbers are listed but action items are not stated.*”
 - Include language about moving previously non-complete plans forward or state reason for discarding the plan-based on assessments.
 - Emphasize: all plans need to be measureable and impact cited

- **Tip Sheet:**
 - Language and maybe examples on how to state a plan and tie to the resource request, institutional goals and documents, etc.
 - Emphasize: all plans need to be measureable, and the impact cited
 - Emphasize use of good grammar and punctuation
- **Other Discussion:**
 - Brief discussion that for the Addiction Studies PR, some of the courses in the certificate are specific only to addiction studies; but some of the social work courses are shared with another department. This possibly creates a problem when it comes to updated/updating curriculum: ADCT Studies curriculum is up to date but the Sociology courses are not. Who is responsible for overlapping courses?
 - Also discussion that the CT-Residential could use assistance in developing and including viable plans into their program review.
 - Remove “Optional” items in templates

2/24/17 Notes

- Modify template:
 - More focused instructions in the template; e.g. in comprehensives reviews, authors need to not only include data, but provide an analysis of data where pertinent
 - Remove “optional” fields
 - Suggestion to include/separate out data for online and face to face courses for analysis

Executive Summary Notes

11/16/16 Notes

- 5.1 Brief discussion on opening templates sooner for the next program review cycle: the committee felt it is too soon to do this now, but suggest waiting until the committee has had the opportunity to complete the cycle, or most of it, in the event of recommended template and rubric changes
- 6.1 Planning Tab: Student services areas are still using resource requests as their “plan;” planning needs to be broader and if resources are required, then they become part of the planning process.

12/10/16 Notes

6. PRC suggest additional training for administrative service areas in completing the planning section: too many are using resource requests as a plan.

1/27/17 Notes

- **Theme:** Many program review authors are using a resource request as an action “plan;” the committee would like to see instructions added to the template that cautions authors on this. They would also like to see a column for previous assessment and/or future assessment plans.
- Discussion that the liberal arts degree in Fine Arts does not fully support transfer students to California UCs and CSUs. Suggested the Liberal Arts Degree in Fine Arts may be a degree worth reviewing.

2/10/17

- **Theme:** Previous Plans: there seems to be a tendency for reviews that have incomplete plans in this section to not elaborate on why; and either do not move the plan forward or explain why it is being discarded (if it is).

2/24/17

- **Trends:**
 - Tendency to write plans as resource requests, which are not measureable or assessable.
 - Even when assessment are done well, there is a tendency not to include results in planning or resource requests. Still some disconnects tying the process together.
 - Two programs were discussed as possibilities for the 4021 process. These will be forwarded to the VPISD for further action.

**College of the Redwoods
Program Review Committee
2015-16 Program Review Committee Executive Summary**

Program Review Committee Evaluation

All programs submitted a program review to the committee. A total of 30 instructional programs submitted reviews, 23 were annual and 7 were comprehensive (comprehensive reviews included analyzing data trends, such as enrollments, equity and completions). Student development and administrative programs submitted 12 area reviews each. Three programs reviews were new (or baseline): Non-credit/adult education, Distance Education and the Eureka TRIO program.

The program review committee evaluated each program using the attached rubric which has areas corresponding to each section of the program review template. Below are some general observations for instruction, student development, and administrative programs:

Instructional Program Reviews % receiving ratings (E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory, or (D) Developing											
Program Info/Mission			Assessment			Previous Plans			Planning		
E	S	D	E	S	D	E	S	D	E	S	D
77%	23%	0%	37%	47%	17%	30%	53%	17%	40%	43%	17%
-Comprehensives only - Data Analysis			<i>Percentages are based on 30 completed program reviews. The Data analysis percentages are based on seven comprehensive program reviews.</i>								
86%	0%	14%									

Instructional programs are doing a good job reporting how the program supports the mission of the college. Seven percent of programs received “developing” last year compared to zero this year. Assessments continue to improve. Thirty-seven percent received “developing” last year compared to 17% this year. However, there is still some unevenness in using assessment results across programs and tying planning to assessment outcomes. There is room for growth in terms of evaluating previous plans and planning for the next year. Both areas saw more “developing” ratings this year than last, although there were also more “exemplary” ratings this year. Some planning items were tied only to a resource request, without including measureable outcomes.

Instructional Summary/Themes:

- The most common area in need of improvement of assessment is to include some detail on why students did well and whether this occurred based on previous assessments, what change(s) may need to be made to the program based on the assessment.
- Tied to this, the Program Review Committee identified, as a theme for improvement for next year, how to create plans with measureable outcomes, tie to current planning objectives and how to analyze them for maximum efficiency in program review reporting.
- The committee discussed *Section 4.1. Evaluation of Previous Planning*: “measureable outcomes and the impact of previous planning.” In some reviews, planning and the program seem to be disconnected: the plans are not measureable or are not really a “plan.” There should be more analysis of the impact or the impact of the evaluation could be made clearer. The committee discussed defining what constitutes a “plan” and how it should be evaluated.

The PRC would like to compliment all authors on their efforts to effectively report on the health of their programs and recommends reviewing the following instructional reviews, which were exceptional in all areas:

- Biology/Environmental Science – Exemplary Program Review, all sections; but their assessment reports are a model for expressing meaningful language relative to improvement through the assessment cycle.
- Drafting Tech – Exemplary Program Review, all sections; but is an exceptionally good model for evaluating previous plans: concise yet informative
- Manufacturing Technology -Exemplary program review (all sections).
- Physical Science - Exemplary program review (all sections).
- CIS –Exemplary review (all sections).
- Dental Assisting – Exemplary review (all sections).

**College of the Redwoods
Program Review Committee
2015-16 Program Review Committee Executive Summary**

Student Development Program Reviews <i>% receiving ratings (E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory, or (D) Developing</i>																	
Program Info			Data			Equity Data			Assessment			Previous Plan Progress			Planning		
E	S	D	E	S	D	E	S	D	E	S	D	E	S	D	E	S	D
67%	33%	0%	50%	42%	8%	33%	34%	33%	17%	50%	33%	17%	58%	35%	17%	58%	35%
<i>Percentages are based on 12 completed program reviews. Equity data was included in student services reviews.</i>																	

Student development areas, overall, are consistent and satisfactory in analyzing their programs; over 50% were excellent or satisfactory across the board. New to the student development area this year was the evaluation of equity data, which was well done overall, and creates a baseline for comparison in future years. Two programs completed new or “baseline” reviews this year and several were completed by staff new to CR. The reflection on assessment received more “developing” ratings this year than last, and the student services areas will have workshops this summer to enhance their assessment activities.

Student Development Summary/Themes:

- Generally provided good data analysis and reflection of assessment activities.
- Analysis and resolution regarding previous plans should be tied to assessment/data and to current planning. The assessment portion of the template is expected to help authors provide for meaningful program improvement.
- Linking planning to indicators, assessment data and/or institutional plans would strengthen action plans.

The PRC would like to compliment all authors on their efforts to effectively report on the health of their programs and recommends reviewing the following student development reviews:

- DSPS authors for their review which was exemplary in all areas,
- Upward Bound, which was exemplary in analyzing indicators and tying to assessment, and clearly stating the impact of previous planning on student outcomes.

Administrative Services & Presidential Area Program Reviews <i>% receiving ratings (E) Exemplary, (S) Satisfactory, or (D) Developing</i>											
Program Info			Assessment			Previous Plan Progress			Planning		
E	S	D	E	S	D	E	S	D	E	S	D
42%	58%	0%	33%	67%	0%	25%	75%	0%	42%	33%	25%
<i>Percentages are based on 12 completed program reviews.</i>											

Administration program reviews have improved overall. There were fewer exemplary reviews, but there was an increase in “satisfactory” and decrease in “developing” ratings. Some changes were made with the creation of the new template: for example, data analysis was not required, although data to review the program appeared in the assessment section. Many of the administration areas received one-on-one guidance from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness as they began the review process.

Administrative Summary/Themes:

The program review committee recognizes there is still difficulty for areas not directly involved in student learning to develop outcomes that relate meaningfully to overall student success. The PRC recommends some continued additional assistance to help form outcomes, identify useful indicators, and report on their results. The main goal is that the administrative areas understand how their assessments can help uncover areas of the program in need of improvement, and how that can lead to future plans.

College of the Redwoods
Program Review Committee
2015-16 Program Review Committee Executive Summary

Program Review Process Improvements

Institutional Research and ISS worked in conjunction with the Program Review Committee, Deans, staff and some faculty to develop an online template format for all program reviews. The new process was well received district-wide, even allowing for a few glitches. Online templates will be evaluated annually and improvements made in order to facilitate the most effective and efficient program review process possible for the college.

Faculty and staff found that having data and previous year plans imported into the template directly from the previous year review, as well as direct links to data and rubrics, sped up the review process. The completed reviews currently cannot be printed in total; a solution to this is in the works. The PRC Committee was also able to directly input comments into the response section and submit, which improved and reduced the committee workload quite a bit.

Future improvements will include the ability to print the completed review and revise some sections slightly for clarity of instruction. The committee discussed sending the final Executive Summary via email with links to the templates, to ensure all receive this information.

The committee also plans on utilizing the language from the rubrics directly into the committee response section, to provide consistency, and include examples for improvement.

Program Review Committee Recommendations

Instruction

- Continue to emphasize to program authors the importance of tying the assessment, data, planning, and resource requests sections together. Assessment and evaluation of student achievement and past planning should inform plans for the upcoming year, which can result in the need for additional resources.
- Program review committee representatives to attend division and/or department meetings to refresh and provide skills for better program reviews, including a Tips and Tricks document created by the program review committee to aid in tying assessments to planning, creating plans and reviewing prior planning.
- Move comprehensive reviews to a four year cycle to match the assessment cycle.

Student Services Areas

- Revise the prompts in the data and assessment sections so that they more clearly direct the author's response.
- Provide examples of exemplary data analysis and assessment activity performed by programs.

Administration Areas

- Continue to improve planning and assessment sections of program review.
- Collect and analyze data whenever possible.
- Include narrative of area improvements or plans for improvement.